REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,574,443 to Hsieh (hereafter "Hsieh") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118282 to Nakamura (hereafter "Nakamura"). Claims 3 and 7-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh and Nakamura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,441,943 to Roberts et al. (hereafter "Roberts"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 19 and 20 are all directed to an outside mirror for a vehicle comprising "a visible-light emitting unit that emits visible light" and where "the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit." Hsieh, Nakamura, and Roberts fail to disclose or suggest this combination of features in claims 1, 19 and 20, or their attendant advantages.

The Office Action correctly recognizes that Hsieh fails to disclose a visible-light emitting unit in its mirror 14, stating on page 2, "Hsieh fails to explicitly state the light-emitting unit is a visible-light emitting unit that emits visible light." The Office Action, however, supplies Nakamura for disclosing a visible-light emitting unit. Applicant submits that Nakamura fails to cure the deficiencies of Hsieh.

Nakamura fails to disclose a visible-light emitting unit in its side view mirror 30. Nakamura discloses that its lighting unit 20 of the mirror 30 includes six infrared light emitting diodes D1-D6 (paragraph [0031]). Nowhere does Nakamura disclose that its light unit 20 emits visible light. The Office Action cites to paragraph [0024] as an image capturing unit that emits both visible and infrared light. The cited section of Nakamura, however,

merely discloses that the imager 10a of video camera 10 is sensitive to visible light. The cited section does not suggest that the mirror 30 of Nakamura includes a visible-light emitting unit, much less one arranged as recited in claims 1, 19 and 20. Thus, even if Hsieh and Nakamura were combined, the combination mirror would not include a visible-light emitting unit.

Moreover, both Hsieh and Nakamura clearly teach away from including a visible-light emitting unit in their side view mirrors. Hsieh discloses that its CCD camera should be invisible to the outside world to prevent theft of the camera (See col. 3, lines 9-12). Including a visible-light emitting unit in the Hsieh mirror would function to illuminate the mirror, thus possibly making the CCD camera visible, which is contrary to the teachings of Hsieh. Nakamura discloses that infrared light emitting diodes should be used in its lighting unit so that no undesirable visible light is externally emitted from its automobile (See paragraph [0039]). In light of both Hsieh and Nakamura teaching away from including a visible-light emitting unit in their side view mirrors, one skilled in the art would not have modified Hsieh to include such a light emitting unit.

Roberts was cited for allegedly disclosing the use of a prism to control visible light emitted within a range, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hsieh and Nakamura.

Moreover, Hsieh, Nakamura and Roberts fail to realize the advantages of the outside mirror as recited in claims 1, 19 and 20. For example, the arrangement of the visible-light emitting unit such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit prevents blooming in the video image captured by the image capturing unit (See instant specification, page 9, lines 1-4). Hsieh and Roberts fail to suggest this advantage in an outside mirror with a visible-light emitting unit.

The Office Action, on page 3, states that Hsieh does meet the claim limitation that the light emitting unit is arranged such that the light emitted does not directly enter into the image-capturing unit. Hsieh, however, does not meet the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 20, because Hsieh fails to suggest a side mirror with a visible-light emitting unit. The illuminator 23 of Hsieh emits infrared light, not visible-light. See column 3, lines 5-8 of Hsieh. Hsieh

provides no suggestion of where to arrange a visible-light emitting unit, much less in the arrangement as claimed.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, claim 4 further comprises a lens that transmits the visible light emitted. The Office Action equates the light-transmissive shield 22 of Hsieh with the lens as recited in claim 4. Hsieh, however, does not disclose that the transmissive shield 22 is shaped to act as a lens. With respect to claim 4, the Office Action states on page 4, that if "the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In addition, Column 3, lines 12-15 refers to a camera lens that also meets the limitations of the claim." The transmissive shield 22 of Hsieh, however, has flat surfaces through which radiation is transmitted, and thus is not arranged to be capable of acting as a lens. Further with respect to the camera lens disclosed in col. 3, line 15, Hsieh does not disclose that its camera lens is arranged so as to transmit the light from the light emitting unit as required by claim 4.

As another example, claim 6 recites that the "image capturing unit has a mechanism configured to be tilted by manual operation or by remote operation." Hsieh does not disclose this feature. The Office Action on page 4 refers to the system control circuit 6 of Hsieh, for controlling the actuation of the cameras as the mechanism of claim 6. Hsieh, however, does not disclose that the control circuit that actuates the cameras is configured to be tilted.

As another example, claim 3 recites "the visible-light distribution controller is configured as a reflector or a prism." The Office action points to element 2935 of Roberts as being a prism. Roberts, however, discloses element 2935 to be a lens (col. 29, line 11), and does not suggest that the lens 2935 has the structural shape of a prism.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 18, 2006 By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant